

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain in the application and claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 18, and 19 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The recited term "a predetermined standard read out rate" of the first recording medium is clearly defined in the specification at page 16, line 17 to page 17, line 1, using as an example the read out rate for a CD.

The recited term "a predetermined standard recording rate" of the second recording medium is clearly defined in the specification at page 18, lines 4-6, using as an example the recording rate of a 64 mm MO disk.

Claim 10 has been amended to change the recitation "said second recording unit" to --said second recording medium--, thereby giving proper antecedent basis to the recited term.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, and the claims depending therefrom, are clear and definite in their recitation of the present invention and meet all requirements of 35 USC 112.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 13-20 under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Sharples et al.

Features of the present invention are a reproducing unit for

high speed reproduction of a first recording medium, a hard disk drive for storing the output of the reproducing unit, and a recording unit for recording on a second recording medium data read out from the hard disk drive at the known recording rate of the second recording medium. See Fig. 4, page 16, line 7 to page 18, line 8, and page 23, lines 5-8 of the present application, for example.

An advantage of these features of the present invention are that they enable a user to transfer CDs, for example, at a high speed to a hard disk for later copying to another disk at a standard speed.

Looking at Sharples et al. we see that it is silent about the use of a hard disk for storing the high-speed output of the reproducing unit. The memory 66 in Fig. 8 of Sharples et al., pointed to in the Office Action at paragraphs 5(b) and 5(c), is a FIFO RAM.

Further, looking at Sharples et al. we see that it is silent about recording on a second recording medium data read out from the hard disk drive at the known recording rate of the second recording medium. Sharples et al. is a high speed dubbing system that records on analog tapes (49 in Fig. 5) at a high speed using a high-speed analog recorder (38 in Fig. 5).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 13, and 19, and the claims depending therefrom, are not anticipated by Sharples et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of claims 5-12 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sharples et al. in view of Inoue.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, which rejection over Sharples et al. has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Inoue, being unrelated to a high-speed dubbing system, that somehow could be combined with Sharples et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 6 are patentably distinct over Sharples et al. in view of Inoue.

Amended independent claim 7 recites the same features discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 1, 13, and 19 over Sharples et al. and, because there are no features in Inoue that somehow could be combined with Sharples et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 7, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Sharples et al. in view of Inoue.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jay H. Maioli".

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:tb